

## NOTES ON SOME TYPE-SPECIMENS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

By EDGAR A. SMITH, F.Z.S., etc.

Read 12th March, 1897.

THE British Museum has recently obtained from Mr. Sowerby the types of fourteen species of shells which formerly were in the collection of M. B. Thomas, of Brest. An examination of these, and a comparison with the collection of the British Museum, show that several of them had already been described, and were, in fact, merely old species with new names. It is hoped that the following notes will be useful in clearing up points which have probably appeared doubtful to those who may have studied the species in question. It is a very great advantage to have secured these types for the national collection, where they will always remain available to students and collectors. It is often quite impossible to estimate the validity of a species without seeing the actual type. So many incorrect identifications become disseminated, or the original descriptions or figures are so inadequate, that an examination of the type becomes necessary before we can properly estimate a species. Hence the importance of obtaining for our great national collection as many types as possible.

1. *CONUS PREVOSTI*, Sowerby.

Proc. Zool. Soc., 1881, p. 636, pl. lvi, fig. 3.

*Hab.*—New Caledonia.

This very rare shell does not closely compare with any other known species. Perhaps it ranges nearer to *Conus convolutus* and *C. Neptunus* than to any other form.

2. *CONUS CROSSEANUS*, Bernardi.

Journ. de Conch., 1861, p. 168, pl. vi, figs. 5, 6; Crosse, op. cit., 1878, p. 168, pl. iii, figs. 3, 3a; Bernardi, Monog. *Conus*, p. 13, pl. i, figs. 2, 6.

*Hab.*—New Caledonia.

This species is allied to *C. marmoreus*, but apparently distinct. The figures in Sowerby's *Thesaurus* and Tryon's *Manual* appear to represent a variety of that common species, "of which the triangular spots are more or less bluish and which is common at New Caledonia. That variety possesses neither the second veined network, nor the transverse rays of *C. Crosseanus*" (Crosse).

3. *CONUS FULVOCINCTUS*, Crosse.

Journ. de Conch., 1872, p. 214, and 1873, p. 248, pl. xi, fig. 3.

*Hab.*—West Africa.

This appears to be a good species, having no near ally. *Conus consanguineus*, Smith, has a similar fulvous band, but differs in form, being broader at the shoulder and consequently more narrowed anteriorly. The periostracum also is thicker than in the present species.

#### 4. MUREX PENCHINATI, CROSSE.

Journ. de Conch., 1861, p. 351, pl. xvi, fig. 6.

*Hab.*—Nafu, Liou-Teheou.

This species is identical in every respect with *Murex Nuttonia*, Wright,<sup>1</sup> from New Caledonia. The latter is regarded by Tryon<sup>2</sup> as a "mere colour variation" of *M. adustus*, whereas *M. Penchinati* is allowed to stand as a distinct species. Having the advantage of comparing the type of the latter with specimens of the New Caledonian form, I have no hesitation in pronouncing them identical in every particular.

#### 5. MUREX FOURNIERI, CROSSE.

Journ. de Conch., 1861, vol. ix, p. 352, pl. xvi, fig. 7.

*Hab.*—Japan.

Notwithstanding the slight differences pointed out by Lischke between this species and *Murex emarginatus*, Sowerby, 1840, I quite agree with Sowerby in uniting them. *M. unicornis* and *M. monoceros*, with which M. Crosse compares his species, belong to a different group, with which is also associated *M. Nuttallii*, Conrad, considered by Tryon practically the same as *M. Fournieri*.

#### 6. RICINULA REEVEANA, CROSSE.

Journ. de Conch., 1862, p. 47, pl. i, fig. 3.

*Hab.*—Nouhiva, Marquesas Islands.

As pointed out by Tryon,<sup>3</sup> this so-called species is merely a variety of the well-known *Sistrum hystrix*, Lamk.<sup>4</sup>; indeed, beyond the fact of the spire being a little more elevated than usual, it does not differ from ordinary examples. It is quite distinct from the shell figured by Reeve<sup>5</sup> (a form of *Sistrum clathratum*), which M. Crosse supposed was the same as his *Reeveana*.

#### 7. CANCELLARIA SEMPERIANA, CROSSE.

Journ. de Conch., 1863, p. 65, pl. ii, fig. 7.

*Hab.*—New Caledonia.

Quite distinct from all other forms.

<sup>1</sup> Ann. Soc. Malac. Belgique, 1878, vol. xiii, p. 85, pl. ix.

<sup>2</sup> Man. Conch., vol. ii, p. 90.

<sup>3</sup> Man. Conch., vol. ii, p. 183.

<sup>4</sup> Küster, Conch.-Cab., *Purpura*, pl. xxxiii, fig. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Conch. Icon., pl. ii, fig. 9.

## 8. CANCELLARIA ANGASI, CROSSE.

Journ. de Conch., 1863, p. 64, pl. ii, fig. 8.

*Hab.*?

Very different from the rest of the known recent forms.

## 9. CANCELLARIA SOUVERBIEI, CROSSE.

Journ. de Conch., 1868, p. 272, pl. ix, fig. 5.

*Hab.*?

I cannot agree with M. Crosse in separating this shell from *Cancellaria crenifera*, the distinctions which he points out being very trivial, and in one particular inaccurate. He mentions the presence of a tooth at the upper part of the aperture, as if this were absent in *C. crenifera*, which is not the case.

## 10. MITRA CROUANI, CROSSE.

Journ. de Conch., 1868, p. 274, pl. ix, fig. 6.

*Hab.*—Gallapagos Islands.

I cannot accept M. Crosse's decision with regard to the distinctness of this shell from *Mitra conica*, for in the Museum there are two full-grown specimens, of the same colour and same style of markings, that also have the characteristic transverse reddish lines, which, however, are much paler than in typical examples.

In the type of *M. Crouani*, which is only a young shell, the position of these lines is easily traceable upon the white markings, and the curious conical apices are similarly sculptured in all specimens. The locality "Gallapagos Islands" is probably erroneous.

## 11. CERITHIUM GOURMYI, CROSSE.

Journ. de Conch., 1861, p. 171, pl. vi, figs. 1, 2.

*Hab.*—New Caledonia.

This remarkable shell is very distinct from all other forms of the genus. It varies in the amount of the brown colour-markings, a specimen in the Museum being plainer in this respect than the shell figured by Sowerby (Reeve's Conch. Icon., Mon. *Pyrazus*, fig. 3).

## 12. CLANULUS DANIELI, CROSSE.

Journ. de Conch., 1862, p. 407, pl. xiii, fig. 5.

*Hab.*—New Caledonia.

This species does not belong to *Clanulus*, but has been correctly located in *Gibbula* by Pilsbry and Fischer. The apex of the spire is described by the three above-mentioned authors as purple-reddish, roseate, or rose-coloured, ignoring or overlooking the fact that the extreme tip of the spire, consisting of about two whorls, is always

whitish. It is the third whorl which exhibits the pink tint, the spiral liræ only being of this colour, and the interstices pale.

13. *MONODONTA* *BOURCIERI*, Crosse.

Journ. de Conch., 1863, p. 178, pl. vi, fig. 6.

*Hab.*—New Caledonia.

This species, which belongs to the genus *Euchelus*, has been described three times, Gould in 1849 having named it *Trochus* (*Monodonta*) *instrictus*, and A. Adams, in 1851, *Monodonta* *alveolata*. The latter appears to have escaped the notice of Mr. Pilsbry in his monograph of the Trochidæ in the eleventh volume of the Manual of Conchology, nor is it referred to by Fischer in the *Icon. Coq. Viventes*.

14. *TROCHUS* *FOURNIERI*, Crosse.

Journ. de Conch., 1863, p. 180, pl. vi, fig. 5.

*Hab.*—New Caledonia.

A very well-marked species of *Cantharidus*, distinguished by its elongate conical form and the very fine spiral striæ, visible only under the lens. The figure given by Fischer,<sup>1</sup> and copied by Pilsbry,<sup>2</sup> represents a coarsely granulated shell, totally unlike the type. Some mistake must have crept in, or the drawing is most faulty.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kiener's *Icon. Coq. Viv. (Trochus)*, pl. cxix, fig. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Tryon's *Man. Conch.*, vol. xi, pl. xlv, fig. 51.